

BETWEEN 'FREEDOM AS AUTONOMY' AND 'FREEDOM AS POTENTIALITY' ARTISTIC WORK IN A PARTICIPATORY CULTURE

DITTE VILSTRUP HOLM

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: DITTE VILSTRUP HOLM, POSTDOC AT DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT, POLITICS AND PHILOSOPHY, COPENHAGEN BUSINESS SCHOOL. EMAIL: DVH.MPP@CBS.DK

© 2019. DITTE VILSTRUP HOLM. THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE DISTRIBUTED UNDER THE TERMS OF THE CREATIVE COMMONS ATTRIBUTION-NON COMMERCIAL 3.0 UNPORTED LICENSE ([HTTP://CREATIVECOMMONS.ORG/LICENSES/BY-NC/3.0/](http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/)), PERMITTING ALL NON-COMMERCIAL USE, DISTRIBUTION, AND REPRODUCTION IN ANY MEDIUM, PROVIDED THE ORIGINAL WORK IS PROPERLY CITED.

**CITATION: CONJUNCTIONS: TRANSDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL OF CULTURAL PARTICIPATION, VOL. 6., NO. 1, 2019
DOI: [HTTP://DX.DOI.ORG./10.7146/TJCP.V6I1.117321](http://dx.doi.org/10.7146/TJCP.V6I1.117321)**

KEYWORDS

PARTICIPATORY ART, PARTICIPATORY CULTURAL POLICY, WORK LIFE, BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION, POST-BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION, FREEDOM AS AUTONOMY, FREEDOM AS POTENTIALITY, INSTRUMENTALIZATION

ABSTRACT

CONTEMPORARY CULTURAL POLICY PROMOTES THE VALUE OF PARTICIPATORY PRACTICES, INCLUDING PARTICIPATORY ART. HOWEVER, THIS EMPHASIS RENDERS CULTURAL POLICY SUBJECT TO THE ART COMMUNITY'S WIDESPREAD AND GENERALIZED SUSPICION THAT GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES INSTRUMENTALIZE ARTISTIC PRACTICES TO SERVE PURPOSES OTHER THAN THOSE PURSUED BY ARTISTS THEMSELVES. THIS ARTICLE ADDRESSES THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARTICIPATORY ART, PARTICIPATORY CULTURE AND CULTURAL POLICY, FOCUSING IN PARTICULAR ON NOTIONS OF ARTISTIC AUTONOMY. SPECIFICALLY, THE ARTICLE USES ORGANIZATION THEORY'S DISCUSSION OF FREEDOM IN WORK TO FRAME ART THEORY'S SUSTAINED, ALBEIT DIFFERENTLY CONCEPTUALIZED, PREOCCUPATION WITH NOTIONS OF ARTISTIC AUTONOMY IN RESPECT TO THE BUREAUCRATIC ORGANIZATION OF LIFE IN MODERNITY. EMPIRICALLY, THE ARTICLE ANALYSES AN INSPIRATIONAL CATALOGUE THAT PROMOTES THE USE OF PARTICIPATORY ART AND CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT IN PUBLIC ART PROJECTS AS A WAY OF CHALLENGING THE ART COMMUNITY'S GENERALIZED SUSPICION, WHILE ALSO SUGGESTING THAT DANISH ARTS POLICY IS RENEGOTIATING THE ROLE OF ART IN CONTEMPORARY SOCIETY BY TAKING ADVANTAGE OF CONTEMPORARY OPPORTUNITIES FOR SEIZING ARTISTIC FREEDOM. CONTEMPORARY PARTICIPATORY CULTURE, IT IS ARGUED, CONDITIONS AS WELL AS PROMOTES ARTISTIC PRACTICE, THUS GENERATING NEW ARTISTIC POSSIBILITIES, ALTHOUGH ONLY TO THE EXTENT THAT ARTISTS ENGAGE IN COLLABORATION WITH OTHER ORGANIZATIONS, INCLUDING THOSE AFFECTING CULTURAL POLICY.



Introduction

This article addresses the relationship between participatory art, participatory culture and cultural policy, with a particular focus on notions of artistic autonomy. Since the 1990s, new explorations of audience and community involvement in the development and realization of artistic projects have proliferated in the visual arts field. To varying degrees, these burgeoning forms of artistic practices are opening up the creative process to participants and, as such, are challenging inherited notions of artistic autonomy, in particular as these relate to autonomous creative work. Conversely, however, other notions of artistic autonomy, specifically in correlation with notions of political autonomy, are simultaneously being reinvigorated. The article aims to discuss the relationship between participatory art and the broader context of a participatory culture, emphasizing in particular the way in which artistic work and notions of artistic autonomy are intimately related to the heteronomous dependencies of the structural support systems needed to realize such work. Within current participatory culture and what has been referred to as "participatory cultural policy" (Sørensen 2014), art's relationship to heteronomous dependencies is exposed and complicated, and the dilemmas and conflicts that arise from this situation offer an interesting topic for critical reflection.

Empirically, I focus on the contemporary Danish context, specifically an inspirational catalogue addressing the potentials of citizen involvement and participatory art in public art projects. The catalogue is entitled 'The art of embedding: about participation in and communication of art projects in public spaces' and was published in 2015 by the Danish Agency for Culture together with the Danish Arts Foundation.¹ I will use this catalogue as a paradigmatic example to illustrate how Danish arts policy is renegotiating the relationship between artistic autonomy and its heteronomous dependencies. From the perspective of an art field generally rife with suspicion that art is being instrumentalized and co-opted (see, for instance, Bishop 2012), the inspirational catalogue conjures up concerns about the infringement of policy on artistic autonomy. These suspicions stem, for example, from Adorno and Horkheimer's early critique of the culture industry, but have today expanded to include a suspicion of governmental strategies as well (Adorno & Horkheimer 1993, Bishop 2012). My analysis of the catalogue offers another, albeit complementary, perspective that stresses the potentially nurturing relationship between art and cultural policy rather than the possible exploitation of one by the other. To this end, I lean on organization studies' reflections about contemporary work life conditions, drawing, in particular, on the useful distinction between "freedom as autonomy" and "freedom as potentiality" proposed by organization researcher Christian Maravelias (Maravelias 2007).

First, however, various theoretical fields must be interwoven. These include art history's theorization of participatory art, historical studies of the relationship of art to its heteronomous dependencies, as well as organization studies' critical reflections about modern and postmodern organizations. All of these sources combine to provide an analytical lens through which to view the specific way in which Danish art policy organizations frame art's role in society. Thus, the article starts by sketching out art history's discussion of participatory practices with a special emphasis on foregrounding the continued importance of notions of artistic autonomy. Next, I move on to situate artistic practices with respect to a particular Western post-World War 2 organization of public art's support, which I connect to broader Western trends in the organization of modern life. Here I bring cultural policy and the sociology of art into dialogue with organization studies' critical reflections about freedom in contemporary work, my aim being to reflect on the effects of public support systems. Finally, using the analytical distinction between freedom as autonomy and freedom as potentiality proposed by Christian Maravelias, I discuss the inspirational catalogue and suggest that the catalogue might be viewed not only as a strategy of instrumentalization and co-optation of artistic practices, but also as a strategy for advancing and supporting artistic practices within a participatory culture.

Notions of autonomy in discussions of participatory art

Artistic autonomy is a notion that is polymorphous in its meaning (Sestoff 1999, Osborne 2012), and the very complexity of the notion sustains its agile use in contemporary discussions of participatory art. Artistic autonomy refers to artists' freedom of expression and to the artwork as being responsible only to the autonomous rules of art. Artistic autonomy is closely connected to the notion of aesthetic autonomy and to the history of philosophical aesthetics, which is sometimes used as evidence of art's universal appeal and thus apolitical *raison d'être* (De Bloois 2012). Artistic autonomy, furthermore, refers to the relatively autonomous sphere of art in society – also called the art institution or the art field – and its structural support of artistic autonomy.

To varying degrees, discussions of participatory art have challenged and complicated the value of autonomous creative practices and the presupposition that art should be accountable only to the autonomous rules of art. One example is the move in the early 1990s USA to define a "new genre public art" that countered the modernist legacy of public art defined as a sculpture in a public square or park (Lacy 1995, Finkelpearl 2013). The term new genre public art came out of a process, organized by artist and educator Suzanne Lacy, of bringing together experimental public art practitioners who were concerned with community engagement, collaborative practices and social concerns, and it led to the edited publication *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art* (Lacy 1995), amongst other things. In this publication, art theorist Suzi Gablik specifically criticizes the one-directional expressivity of the singular author and referred to modern public art as "non-participatory", "non-relational" and "non-interactive", indeed equating it to a position of disinterest in the world outside the artist's studio itself (Gablik 1995). In contradistinction, she framed new genre public art as characterized by a "connective aesthetics" that featured emphatic listening and co-creative practices.

The notion of new genre public art constitutes one of the starting points for the contemporary discussion of participatory art (Finkelpearl 2014). Another is the French curator Nicolas Bourriaud's notion of "relational aesthetics" that he coined in the 1990s to capture a number of contemporary artists' shared interest in human interaction and its social context (Bourriaud 1996, Bourriaud 2002). Bourriaud especially highlighted the way in which these artists no longer produced aesthetic objects, but rather developed aesthetic situations, offering gifts and services to exhibition audiences and staging social events, thus emphasizing a new co-creative and collaborative practice inside art institutions (Bourriaud 2002). He was less concerned with criticizing 'autonomous' artistic practices than with defining the shared traits of these new collective events and framing them as a critical response to the declining social relations in contemporary society (Bourriaud 2002).

The notions of 'relational aesthetics' and 'new genre public art' each independently sought to frame a new 'genre' of artistic practice that was broadly characterized by its inclusion of people as participants and by its political critique of contemporary society. The discussions on these separate strands later merged into a heated debate between art critics Claire Bishop and Grant Kester (Bishop 2006, Kester 2006), and the differences between their respective takes on participatory artistic practices have subsequently come to define art history's theorization of participatory art, not least because the two have respectively presented some of the most in-depth and monograph-expansive studies in the field (Kester 2004, Kester 2011, Bishop 2012). Their conflicting positions thus offer a key discussion for how notions of artistic autonomy are discussed in respect to participatory art, and for this reason, I will engage with their arguments in more depth.

Aestheticized confusion versus dialogical engagement

Claire Bishop entered the discussion through a critique of Bourriaud's concept of relational aesthetics, which she found lacked normative criteria for evaluating the quality of the professed human interactions (Bishop 2004). Bourriaud's choice of relational art projects collectively presented a convivial interpretation of social encounters, but Bishop used Chantal Mouffe's and Ernesto Laclau's political theory of radical democracy to argue that not all social relations are convivial. To drive home her argument, Bishop pointed to the critical potential of artistic projects that create "...sensations of unease and discomfort rather than belonging, because the work acknowledges the impossibility of a 'microtopia' and instead *sustains* a tension among viewers, participants, and context" (Bishop 2004, p. 70, italics in original). Bishop would subsequently turn to the philosophy of Jacques Rancière to argue that the political potentials of participatory art depend on its aesthetic ability to confuse the borders between art and the social (Bishop 2006, Bishop 2012). In this context Jeremy Deller's performative event *Battle of Orgreave* is a prime example, in part because Bishop finds that it defies easy description and evaluation (Bishop 2012). Broadly speaking, the event restaged a violent historical confrontation between striking miners and the police in the UK, with the participation of some of the original strikers, along with historical reenactment societies. As Bishop recounts the performative event and its recorded documentation, the artist set a potentially chaotic event in motion and the participating miners responded to it in different ways, with some experiencing the opening up of old wounds and others a therapeutic healing. Importantly, the very openness of the event from the perspective of participants and spectators alike comes to underline Bishop's concern for the value of autonomous aesthetic experiences that, in her opinion, are only generated if artists are granted the autonomy to experiment

with participatory formats, including the possible exploitation and provocation of participants (Bishop 2012).

Bishop also voiced criticism of what she referred to as ethically motivated art projects that diffused into community activities, to her mind losing their aesthetic potency in the process (Bishop 2006). Grant Kester, on the other hand, had already proposed a new "dialogical aesthetics" to capture such artistic practices (Kester 2004). One case in point was Suzanne Lacy's *Oakland Projects*, a dialogue project between teenagers and police officers that addressed tensions between these groups through events, workshops and mentor programmes. For Kester, the dialogical emphasis in Lacy's work suggests that art might have transformative potentials in other ways than as an avant-garde shock. Leaning on the political theories of Jürgen Habermas, he argued that dialogical art projects organize a kind of temporary public space in which people might meet to discuss issues of joint concern without the usual partisan politics involved (Kester 2004). In general, Kester has been keen to emphasize the actual local effects and results of artistic interventions, often stressing the long-term commitment that artists invest in particular sites and issues of concern. However, Kester's argument also entailed a broad critique of what he calls mainstream art criticism, which values art's indecipherability and ambiguity because it counters the legibility of market-driven visibility and theorizes art's ability to psychologically shock the viewer out of complacency as – somewhat paradoxically – a way of sensitizing the viewer to other, more authentic forms of experience (Kester 2004). Still, argues Kester, mainstream art criticism sees art's emancipatory power as largely symbolic and indirect, for any direct critique of contemporary society is thought to be futile (Kester 2011). In fact, Kester traces a history of modern art theory from Schiller's *Aesthetic Education* to the failed student revolt of May 1968, which results in a kind of third way:

...to retain the purity and integrity of the revolutionary message [by working] indirectly, via the insulting protection of ancillary, quasi-autonomous, institutions (the arts, higher education) to develop covert, subversive "interventions" in the cultural sphere... (Kester 2011, p. 46)

Kester's critique of mainstream art criticism is also an implicit critique of Bishop's insistence on the transformative power of aestheticized events and the value of an autonomous artistic sphere. Via Rancière, Bishop insists that the political potential of artistic practices is tied to their interventionist 'aesthetic' potentials and thus offers something entirely different from other forms of practices. Art's political potential is connected to its ability to confuse established ways of seeing and doing, which might just as well take place within a white-cube setting that Bishop appears to consider neutral (Jackson 2011). On this point, Bishop arguably occupies a minority position within the discussions about participatory art, although an extremely visible and insistent position.

However, I would argue that Kester and other proponents of new genre public art who support the dismantling of autonomous creativity in favour of co-creative practices and dialogical relations also adhere to the value of artistic autonomy. In this conceptualization, however, artistic autonomy is not tied to the artist's creative expressivity or innovative experiments with participatory involvement, but rather to the artist's political autonomy. Such a conceptualization comes across in discussions about socially engaged practices that address the power relations between authorities, artists and local communities, in which, it is argued, artists occupy an autonomous position that enables them to criticize authorities and distribute resources to the community (Kester 2004, Kester 2011).

The importance of artistic autonomy also asserts itself in the durational emphasis within discussions of participatory and collaborative practices. In such discussions prolonged periods of time and open-ended processes emerge not only as the key to a successful participatory engagement but also as a must for a work of art to have merit (O'Neill & Doherty 2011). As the art theorist Dave Beech has pointed out, while new genre public art might have renounced the monumentality of public sculpture, it has introduced a new kind of monumentality in the form of the ideology of the monumentality of time:

Having rejected the monumental object of public art, new genre public art does not sacrifice monumentality altogether but converts it from being a quality of the object into a quality of the temporal experience of community arts projects. Duration asserts itself in the 'monumental time' of the dematerialized public work. The dematerialized monument is a monument to the community built out of the social relations of the community itself. Time becomes monumentalized within an ethic of the artist's prolonged engagement with the public. (Beech 2011, p. 319)

This ideology of duration, I would argue, carries with it a reconceptualization of artistic autonomy, because it indicates an enthusiasm for the expanded reach of artistic practice. Whether such practices take the form of self-organized alternative spaces or the re-distribution of resources to communities deprived of political influence, the value of artistic projects is tied to the durational scope of their impact on society and thus to the artist's ability to establish different – one might say 'artistically' generated – spaces in society. Kester even goes another step further, indicating that the long-term engagement of the artists he is discussing are not financed by public arts funding, as was the case with European relational aesthetics, but rather by the artists' selling their work or seeking ad hoc support, for instance, which thus enables them to operate more autonomously (Kester 2011). Artistic autonomy is thus tied to political autonomy and strictly separated not only from market forces or new public government strategies but also from any source of funding whatsoever, including funding for autonomous art. Kester seems to imply that white-cube artists play safely in their protected spaces, all the while depending on the government to secure their existence, while mature and *truly* autonomous artists use diverse means to generate funds and channel them into concrete situations, thus sharing their political autonomy with the local communities with whom they collaborate.

Artistic autonomy and society's organization

Above I have described how notions of artistic autonomy influence the discussions and theorization of participatory art in various ways. Artists' autonomous creative competencies are no longer intimately tied to individual expressivity. Instead, participatory practices are framed as various forms of artistically created 'spaces' that have the possibility of aesthetically suggesting new forms of social organizing. For Kester, such practices need to intervene in the mess of existing social organizing, while Bishop recognizes a stronger political potency in the symbolic dimension of artistic practices inside a white-cube setting. The two opponents, however, are both sceptical of the possible instrumentalization and co-optation of artistic practices. Bishop has criticized governmental bodies' use of artistic practices, especially when unfolded as community engagement (Bishop 2012). She predicates her argument against such correlations on the way in which cosy art experiences cover up cutbacks in social support systems and thus turn into practices that disguise rather than address political problems. Kester, for his part, has cautioned artists against allowing themselves to get played by political powers in their well-meaning efforts to support specific communities (Kester 1995). In particular, he emphasizes how practices aimed at empowering communities risk speaking in a language that replicates the idea that poverty and misfortune stem from individual moral errors rather than systemic ones (Kester 1995). While Bishop responds to the threat of instrumentalization and co-optation by insisting on the importance of artistic autonomy as a necessary 'space' for artistic experimentation and the very precondition required for any art to offer political critique, Kester instead emphasizes the necessity of artists' intervening in existing power relations and modes of social organizing that serve to highlight the political issues at stake (Kester 2011, Bishop 2012).

The concern with instrumentalization and co-optation is perpetuated by a general distrust of and a genuine political critique of contemporary society's organization, which is generally framed as being a result of neoliberal ideology and capitalist expansion (Thompson 2015, Sholette 2017). As such, the threat of becoming part of the very same organizational practices that art – especially politically motivated participatory art – seeks to counter, stimulates the need to distance those very practices in order to protect them. At the same time, I would argue, the way in which notions of artistic autonomy are not only challenged but also reinvigorated in the discussions of participatory art points to a particular self-understanding within the field of visual arts that has developed in Western countries post-World War 2, and is now being variously confronted. This self-understanding is exposed and complicated because of the way in which participatory practices themselves transgress previously discrete borders between artists and participants as well as between the art institution and broader social networks, but also because these experiments are taking place amid wider changes in society's organization that affect artists' working conditions. To further analyze these changes, I turn to organization studies' critical reflections about work life and, in particular, the relative freedom granted to individuals in respect to work.

Freedom in work

Within organization studies, a broad distinction is made between the modern or bureaucratic organization of work, on the one hand, and the postmodern or post-bureaucratic organization of work, on the other (Knights & McCabe 1998, Maravelias 2007). Whereas modern society organized work into specialized areas of competencies that were further discretely separated from the sphere of private life, contemporary work's organization promotes the blurring of barriers between specialized fields and between professional life and private life (Knights & McCabe 1998, Maravelias 2007, Budtz-Jørgensen et al 2019). Obviously, this differentiation is a simplification, setting up dichotomies where a broader palette of diverse forms is in play. However, such dichotomies serve to emphasize changes that are also increasingly affecting the field of art with respect to the working conditions of artists. These changes particularly affect notions of artistic autonomy when artistic practice both overcomes barriers to engage with society's organization and itself becomes part of the strategies by which other organizations and institutions approach the organizing of society.

A particular critical point of interest for organization studies is the relative freedom granted to individuals in respect to contemporary work (Maravelias 2007). The shift from a modern bureaucratic organization of work to a post-bureaucratic one was partly motivated by the critique levelled at the restrictive effects of bureaucratic organizations, also in respect of individual workers' freedom (Du Gay 1994). In response to this critique, post-bureaucratic organizations of work have been promoted as ways of setting individuals free, as such organizations enabled creativity and innovation as well as allowing discrete borders between specialized areas and between working life and private life to be transcended – a change that has been argued to find its inspiration within the field of art (Boltanski & Chiapello 2007).

However, organization studies have emphasized how this purported freedom actually expresses subtle forms of power that exert even greater control over individual workers than the bureaucratic organization of work does (Willmot 1993, Barker 1993, Casey 1999). Inspired by Foucault's work on discipline and the metaphor of the panopticon, some have argued that management uses organizational programmes and development techniques to encourage commitment and identification with organizational values, thus implementing peer- and self-control as a form of surveillance where individuals come to identify so strongly with their work that it ultimately takes over their entire lifeworlds (Casey 1999, Flemming & Spicer 2004). Other studies have focused on the possibility of resisting such disciplinary systems, drawing, for example, on Foucault's work on subjectivity as a process in which subjects actively take part in their own subordination to power and thus partake in ongoing negotiations of their commitment or resistance to the given organizational values (Knight & McCabe 1998).

While these studies tend to address contemporary working conditions in broad terms, leaning on case studies in fields as diverse as call centres, banks and grocery stores, the working conditions of creative workers and professional artists have also received attention (Banks 2010, Loacker 2013, Beirne et al 2017). Such studies look, for instance, at how artists negotiate the conflicting relationship between creative practices and commercial opportunities, as well as at how the precarious reality of a flexible artistic practice dependent on ad hoc funding might prop up artists' self-understanding of the meaningful quality of their work (Loacker 2013). In other words, some artists also substantiate their self-understanding as creative individuals with reference to their precarious working life conditions.

I am especially inspired by an argument developed by Christian Maravelias, who differentiates between two ways of conceptualizing freedom in order to describe the difference between the modern, bureaucratic organization of work and its contemporary post-bureaucratic organization. As he argues, the Enlightenment thinkers first conceived of "freedom as autonomy" by connecting freedom to the rational subject that self-consciously governs their own life, thus interpreting freedom in "...negative terms, i.e. as the absence of coercion and domination..." (Maravelias 2007, p. 558). However, this understanding of freedom has been countered by a more practice-oriented conception of freedom related to taking part in the world that is embedded in a common understanding of freedom as the ability to initiate and complete certain actions. This interpretation diverges from the Enlightenment tradition in that "...power is no longer an antithesis to freedom but instead becomes an integral part of freedom" (Maravelias 2007, p. 559). In other words, freedom is not liberation from power, as "...it requires power – power to act and to seize on opportunities" (Maravelias 2007, p. 559). These two conceptualizations of freedom differ in that one sees freedom as autonomy as being a freedom from power, though still safeguarded by it, while the other sees freedom as potentiality, which indicates the possibility of seizing opportunities via distributed power, although this also entails that such

freedom is no longer necessarily protected by power. It also means that freedom is not solely to be measured in terms of degrees of freedom, but also in terms of the nature of this freedom.

Maravelias positions these disparate conceptualizations of freedom within the bureaucratic and the post-bureaucratic forms of organizing society respectively, which both extend beyond the sphere of work. He broadly speaks of organizational practices in modernity versus postmodernity. Bureaucracy organizes freedom vis-à-vis the heteronomy of the bureaucratic organization, granting citizens freedom to exercise professional judgment in their professional field and in their lives outside of work. In both forms, however, freedom is circumscribed because it depends on a bureaucratic system that both supports and restricts autonomy. In the post-bureaucratic organization, on the other hand, freedom depends on the seizing of opportunity, but is no longer necessarily guaranteed by the bureaucratic system.

Freedom and the art field

Organization studies' discussions of work conditions provide an interesting analytical perspective on what the sociology of art refers to as the art field (Bourdieu 2017). Broadly speaking, the sociology of art has described how the modern field of art gained an increasingly autonomous position structurally and financially supported by the market and modern forms of governing (Tanner 2003). In sociologist Andreas Reckwitz' summary, modernity compartmentalized art from the rest of society, thus generating a field of art consisting of four elements:

The subjectivization of the artist as the creator of novelty, initially in the form of the 'original genius': the aesthetic quasi-object, initially in the form of the artwork; the audience, the community of recipients interested in aesthetic novelty; and an institutional complex – markets or state academics – for regulating audience interest. (Reckwitz 2017, p. 33-34)

In broad terms, then, the construction of a particular field of art and the support of artist's expressive autonomy follows the rules of bureaucratic compartmentalization, which underlines an interpretation of freedom as autonomy that is a freedom from the impact of political powers, although safeguarded by those very same powers. In respect to this, art history, which forms part of the institutional complex for regulating audience interest, developed a language for evaluating artworks as autonomous objects (Tanner 2003). As such, the relative autonomy of the artistic field has resulted in a disciplinary self-understanding of art as autonomous in which, as cultural studies researcher Carsten Sestoft argues, the structural condition of this autonomy is typically under-acknowledged (Sestoft 1999). The result, as sociologist Rudi Laermans asserts, is that artists tend to discuss the value of their artworks as distinct from the material and structural conditions that secured their realization (Laermans 2010). Such separation has also characterized the discussions of participatory art practices, despite the fact that these engage with the issue of social organizing. Performance scholar Shannon Jackson, for instance, has commented on the fact that discussions of participatory practices, or social practice as she terms it, paradoxically tend to refrain from engaging with the further organizational system underpinning art's engagement with the social. Jackson diagnoses this tendency as being an expression of "... specific ambivalences toward concepts such as institution, system or governance..." (Jackson 2011, p. 23) that has developed in the art world. Tracing the legacy of the 1960s and early 1970s counter-movements into the contemporary neoliberal and global society, she pinpoints a conflation of anti-institutional attitudes within the arts and critical humanities:

In art worlds and other contexts of the critical humanities, lay discourses of individual choice and flexibility interacted unevenly with critical discourses that valued agency and resistance. Indeed, sometimes a discourse of flexibility and a discourse of critical resistance could work in unwitting mutual support. If institutions were not to be trusted, if regulation constrained, if bureaucracy was a thing to be avoided, and if disciplining systems of subjugation were everywhere, then a generalized critique of system pervaded not only neoliberal policy circles, but also avant-garde artistic circles and critical intellectual ones where freedom was increasingly equated with systemic independence. (Jackson 2011, p. 24, italics in original)

I would argue that the art world's ambivalence towards "concepts like institution, system and governance" is connected to the conditions for artistic practice, especially the ways in which public art's support in post-World War 2 Western societies has been organized to protect and promote artistic autonomy – and has thus enabled the art field to base its self-understanding on the notion of being 'absolutely' free. The belief in systemic independence, as Jackson notes, seems to imply an interpretation of artistic autonomy as if it had no reliance on various systems of support. Although artists are well aware that their practice does rely on such support, there is a general sense in which cultural policy strategies of supporting autonomous art are not interpreted as a cultural policy at all, but as the naturally given and normal way of supporting art. In the following I provide a few historical instances to support this point.

The effect of public support systems for the arts

Obviously, artistic practices lean on a mixture of sources for funding and support, but in a post-World War 2 Western context, government-initiated cultural policy has hugely impacted the artistic field and the self-understanding of artists. Public art support includes, to varying degrees, funding of arts education, exhibiting galleries, and the direct distribution of working grants to professional artists, and all such support has tended to be qualified under a set of quality parameters developed and refined by art experts. One effect of the determination of this structural support of autonomous artistic value criteria is that it has left the art field unprepared to deal with the possibility that the support for art might be withdrawn or differently organized. A few historical examples may serve to underline this argument, illustrating both how public arts funding has supported and nurtured the field of art, but also how this support has been subject to political changes that have affected the conditions for artistic practice.

One such case is the National Endowments for the Arts (NEA) in the USA. The NEA was established in 1960 and organized to support non-profit organizations, public agencies and individuals with exceptional talent. Moreover, as political scientist Laretta Conkling Frederking argues, the institution was extremely successful in nurturing and developing a community around the arts in the 1960s and 1970s (Frederking 2009). Within the space of seven years, NEA support led to the establishment of state agencies for the arts in every US state, where only five had previously existed, and individual grants to artists boosted the number of artists and their geographical spread. Frederking's argument is meant to counter the preconception of government as bureaucratic and uninventive, instead underlining its ability to nurture and develop a new nationwide interest in the arts:

By setting up the NEA, government created channels for people's energies into artistic activities. By institutionalizing so many opportunities for exhibition and creation, the number of artists increased exponentially as did the different aesthetics and locations where art was produced. (Frederking 2009, p. 58)

These governmental strategies provided funding for artists while also encouraging citizens to become engaged in the arts. They also affected the image of artists from the perspective of both citizens and the artists themselves, transforming them from marginal decadent figures into representatives of the core of human meaning and freedom. However, according to Frederking, the very success of the NEA also developed into a dependency between governments and the arts, and she argues that the NEA turned into a depoliticized practice in which the arts community, in particular, thought that the NEA's expansion and success would last forever. This, however, was not to be. In the so-called culture wars that flared up in the late 1980s, fiscal conservatives were able to deploy two controversial artworks as a strategy to change the public's opinion about art: these were Andres Serrano's *Piss Christ* and Robert Mapplethorpe's homoerotic nude photographs, both of which had been indirectly supported by the NEA via federal grants to the exhibiting museums. The ensuing controversy succeeded in reverting the public's perception of artists and artistic freedom from one that evoked a sense of national pride back to one that projected an image of moral decay. One ramification of this development was the elimination of individual federal grants to artists in 1995.

From the perspective of the arts community, the criticism raised against the artists and the NEA constituted a political attack on the freedom of artistic expression. However, political scientist Margaret Jane Wyszormirski argues that the conflict was facilitated and exacerbated by certain myths and misconceptions within the arts community (Wyszormirski 1995). One such myth was that the norm for federal arts policy was set in the 1970s in the period that Frederking calls the NEA's entrepreneurial phase (Wyszormirski 1995). The arts community, Wyszormirski argues, seemed to think that the politically untroubled expansion of

public support for the arts was normal and sustainable, thus rendering the ensuing decline abnormal. Part of this myth also involves the belief that discipline-specific funds were the NEA's primary purpose, which imbued the NEA with an elitist aura (Wyszormirski 1995). Thus, Wyszormirski argues:

The growth of the arts audiences, particularly in size and in geographic dispersion, seemed to cultivate a 'field of dreams' presumption that if quality, professional arts were made available, the citizenry would patronize them (in all senses of the words 'patronize' — through attendance, through financial contribution and through political approval). (Wyszormirski 1995, p. 21)

In a European context, similar political confrontations around public arts funding occurred after the turn of the millennium (Møller 2012, Seijdel 2012). The joint forces instigating these confrontations were the renewed political influence of nationalist right-wing parties and the austerity measures implemented following the financial crisis of 2008. In the Netherlands, for instance, public arts funding was dramatically downscaled in 2010 when the political coalition of a populist-liberal government was in power (Seijdel 2012). The Dutch population broadly supported the cutbacks, indicating, as art theorist John Byrne phrases it, that

...there is a change in the public's conception of contemporary art. What was once generally accepted as a necessary and functioning component of a progressive and self-reflexive society is now treated with distrust and disdain. (Byrne 2012)

The European situation mirrors the US culture wars to the extent that the art world's rhetorical argument against the cutbacks invoked the concept of artistic autonomy. In particular, argues Dutch cultural theorist Joist de Bloois, the art world responded with melancholic claims about the universal significance of art — claims that were intended to justify the state's continuous support of autonomous spaces for art (De Bloois 2012). However, such arguments proved ineffectual against the populist-liberal government's conceptualization of public interest through the image of the Hardworking Dutchman (De Bloois 2012). De Bloois also argues that the art world's defenders of artistic autonomy are strangely reluctant to acknowledge art's heteronomous dependency (De Bloois 2012). Perhaps, he continues, the very idea of artistic autonomy has to be reconceptualized, given that the relationship of art to society has changed since the bourgeoisie invented artistic autonomy (De Bloois 2012).

I understand these historical situations as testifying to the way in which post-World War 2 cultural support of the arts has institutionalized, and perhaps even internalized, a very specific interpretation of artistic work around notions of artistic autonomy. I will now turn to a discussion of contemporary Danish cultural policy, using the arguments thus far presented to analyze an inspirational catalogue addressing the potentials of citizen involvement and participatory art in public art projects.

The Danish context

In Denmark, public support for autonomous art has arguably had an even longer durational span than in other Western societies. Denmark established the Danish Arts Foundation to provide professional artists with direct support in the form of working grants, and has used this arm's length model in much the same way from its inception in 1964 until today. Generally speaking, the Danish Arts Foundation is responsible for promoting 'the development of the arts', and is organized to distribute funds politically earmarked for artists and artistic productions and granted on the basis of assessed artistic quality and talent.² As the arts foundation is an arm's length organization, politicians have no direct influence on what art and which artists receive support, but have delegated that responsibility to rotating committees of art experts. In 2003 cultural policy researcher Peter Duelund asserted that the effects of broader discussions and changes in Danish cultural policy had influenced neither the organization nor the level of funding allocated to the Danish Arts Foundation (Duelund 2003). Since 2003, however, the arts community has experienced the effects of such discussions and of changes in cultural policy stemming from various factors, including changes in the Danish political landscape, waves of public management reforms aimed at improving institutional efficiency and the effects of a broader participatory culture.

The effects of public management reforms are visible in strategies of institutional mergers. Thus, for instance, the Arts Foundation merged in 2014 with the now former Arts Council, established in 2003 to support specific artistic projects (rather than offering open working grants as the original arts foundation did).³ The Danish Arts Foundation's secretarial support has also been merged with other institutions that implement cultural policy, the result being the establishment of increasingly large units. In 2012, the Danish Agency for Culture was created by way of a merger between the Danish agencies for the arts, for cultural heritage, and for libraries and media, while earlier still, in 2003, the agency for the arts itself had been created as a merger of various specialized agencies within the field of fine arts.⁴ Today, the Danish Agency for Culture has merged with the Agency for Palaces and Cultural Properties to become the Agency for Culture and Palaces.⁵ In terms of funding, Danish public arts funding has not been drastically diminished. However, it has become subject to the general political drive to decrease public spending and has experienced minor cutbacks (Ørskou 2016). The attention focused on public arts funding has also intensified due to the political influence of the right-wing Danish People's Party, which would rather use cultural funding to preserve Denmark's national heritage than to promote the experiments of contemporary artists (Petersen 2015).

Cultural studies researcher Anne Scott Sørensen has argued that the new millennium brought about a participatory cultural policy agenda in Denmark (Sørensen 2014, Sørensen 2015). Some of her early examples begin in 2008 and include inspirational catalogues about user involvement and institutional innovation in the cultural sector, while she also emphasizes that policy documents for the museum sector are particularly forceful drivers of the participatory agenda. As Sørensen explains, this new participatory agenda indicates a particular reconfiguration of cultural policy that mixes elements of economic, social and political rhetoric as expressed through the aims of both attracting new users to cultural institutions and rendering these institutions into spaces for social transformation (Sørensen 2015). While invoking ideals of democracy and political radicality, the policy documents also speak, she argues, in new public management terms such as *added value* and *impact* (Sørensen 2015).

These changes have gradually spurred the field of art and culture to engage in strategies to legitimize the use of public funding for the arts by way of underlining art's societal contribution and developing practices aimed at engaging public support (see, for instance, Jalving 2017). These strategies respond not only to policy changes, but also to internal discussions within the field of cultural studies and museum studies, as these have bridged education research and reflections about democratic citizenship and thus shifted the focus from collections towards audience experience (Anderson 2004, Knell et al 2007). As such, there is a sense in which cultural policy and cultural practitioners are responding to an increasingly participatory culture, or at least to a culture in which citizen involvement, audience development and the transformation of spectators into participants offer a key strategy for substantiating the value of art.

The Danish Arts Foundation has been slower to embrace this agenda than museums and art galleries, but in 2016 it engaged a communication bureau to help promote the story of its contribution to the Danish population, also by means of social media platforms like Facebook and Instagram.⁶ While previously the Danish Arts Foundation had argued that its *raison d'être* was to provide an alternative to the experience economy and cultural industry (Jørgensen 2016), it now seems to be embracing a campaign to underline art's – and the foundation's – broad contribution to Danish society, including by encouraging innovation, fostering community engagement and providing aesthetic experiences.⁷ The inspirational catalogue that I will now discuss constitutes a paradigmatic endeavour in this regard, specifically targeting the field of public art and thus offering insights into how the field of art and, in particular, art's policy institutions are responding to a changing 'participatory culture'.

The inspirational catalogue: promoting or instrumentalizing art?

The inspirational catalogue entitled 'The art of embedding: about participation in and communication of art projects in public spaces' was published in 2015 by the Danish Agency for Culture in collaboration with the Danish Arts Foundation.⁸ It specifically targets the field of public art that the Danish Arts Foundation supports through funding and its collaboration with the legal owners of public spaces and buildings. The inspirational catalogue is not aimed at a singular audience, but broadly targets those institutions and agents involved in public art commissions. These include building owners, city officials, artists, as well as local agents, and the publication is framed around the aspiration of ensuring better collaborative practices in the development

of public art projects. The preface, authored by the secretariat at the Agency for Culture, stresses the importance of balancing expectations as well as the importance of planning processes for user involvement and communication. The opening statement of the introductory text, written by a commissioned art historian, further emphasizes the potentials of user involvement in public art projects, stating: "User involvement is an obvious choice for art projects in public spaces, because art here operates in local environments of importance to citizens' daily life" (Neergaard 2015, p. 5, my translation from Danish). In other words, the inspirational catalogue expresses an interest in engaging the local users of a site in the development of public art works for their particular site, and it does so by presenting examples of user involvement in which the foundation has already engaged, along with key international examples of user involvement.

With its emphasis on participatory practices, the inspirational catalogue might well be seen to join the other cultural policy publications that Anne Scott Sørensen has identified as part of a new participatory cultural policy agenda (Sørensen 2014, Sørensen 2015). This is particularly the case because the catalogue was published by the Agency for Culture, which is responsible for implementing Danish cultural policy. However, the agency is also a secretariat for the Danish Arts Foundation, thus serving two masters – the Ministry of Culture and the Danish Arts Foundation. Above I referred to the recent mergers of cultural policy institutions, and these mergers might impact the relationship between the Agency for Culture and the Danish Arts Foundation. Whereas the secretariat once constituted a small independent unit, it is now part of a much larger, increasingly aligned organization, and thus arguably more susceptible to broader cultural policy agendas than to the policy agendas of the art world.

Viewed through the lens of the art world's suspicion of cultural policy 'instrumentalization', the inspirational catalogue readily poses certain threats to artistic autonomy. First of all, it suggests and promotes the use of citizen involvement in public art projects as well as the commissioning of artists working with participatory practices – to the possible exclusion of other artistic forms and practices. Second, the catalogue connects two forms of participatory practices under the joint goal of embedding public art projects. The first category centers on art projects in which the local citizens and users of a site become co-producers of a work of art. The other category emphasizes the use of citizen involvement and communicative strategies for the purpose of embedding public art projects. The catalogue distinguishes between these two forms, but also pulls them together as potentially aligned strategies. Such an emphasis on embedding public art projects strikes a chord with discussions of public art in which the value of artists' long-term engagement in specific sites has gained growing recognition (O'Neill & Doherty 2011).

However, the very use of artistic case studies in a cultural policy document also resonates with the generalized suspicion of instrumentalization and co-optation of artistic practices: for what purposes is participatory art enlisted, and how does the emphasis on participatory art underscore a new type of judgement of artistic quality that caters to agendas other than the pursuit of artistic quality in itself? For instance, the introduction to the catalogue states that the reflexive and dialogical potentials in participatory art offer more than just a work of art to a particular site: "The local community's identity might be strengthened as the citizen's own reflections about and actions in the city's spaces are activated and they engage in new ways of developing and using these spaces (Neergaard 2015, p. 6, my translation from Danish)." As such participatory art is framed as a site-specific contribution that potentially contributes to community development and a new, active and creative life in the city's public spaces. In fact, such art might promise to solve problems related to a failing sense of community belonging and the general experience of city spaces as dead and empty.

Furthermore, the inspirational catalogue presents artists as experts in citizen involvement, thus underlining participatory artistic practices as part of a long art historical tradition, but also the superior quality of artist-led citizen involvement in contrast to other more traditional forms of citizen involvement. Above I argued that such praise of artistic practice accords with a particular ideology of duration in art-historical discussions. In the context of the inspirational catalogue, however, such an emphasis serves the purpose of addressing local building owners, typically in the form of local government officials, and their concern with the demand and expectation for increasing citizen and user involvement. In other words, the inspirational catalogue addresses a general policy interest in engaging citizens, and offers a solution for doing so: by engaging artists.

All of the above correlations between the inspirational catalogue and broader policy interests position the catalogue within the broader change in cultural policy from the protection and promotion of artistic autonomy to the tentative use of art and culture in the pursuit of other agendas. At the same time, the catalogue underscores the original and autonomous values of artistic work in various ways. While, on the one hand, the inspirational catalogue attempts to 'market' the qualities of participatory

practices in public art projects, it also, on the other hand, uses specific strategies to suppress the 'participatory policy' dimension of the document. First, artistic practices are rhetorically praised as constituting exceptional and groundbreaking practices of citizen involvement that accentuate their superiority vis-à-vis other social practices. Moreover, the curators presented in some of the case studies are described as following in artists' footsteps, which constitutes an important point for an ever-wary community of artists. Second, the very suggestion that we might learn from the sampled case studies is downplayed with cautionary recommendations that stress the lack of a ready-made formula for participatory involvement. In this spirit, site-specific work is underscored as a situation that develops rather than a problem to be solved, and collaborative development is framed as a process rather than a well-defined project. Third, the inspirational catalogue comments on how some artists prefer to work creatively in isolation, whereby citizen involvement becomes a strategy that might be implemented in other aspects of public artwork development.

The inspirational catalogue, I would argue, walks a tightrope between suggesting strategies for how local authorities might benefit in various ways from commissioning participatory art in public spaces and also adhering to the inherited norms of artistic autonomy. It seeks to suggest, but also to suppress the policy perspectives of public art and its usefulness, all the while aspiring to promote and to broaden the use and thus commissioning of public art projects. To further analyze what the inspirational catalogue is doing, I think it is useful to engage with the distinction between freedom as autonomy and freedom as potentiality that organization scholar Christian Maravelias proposed in order to distinguish, broadly, between how freedom was conceptualized in the modern bureaucratic society and how it is organized in our contemporary post-bureaucratic society. To repeat the argument in short, freedom as autonomy requires a powerful system to safeguard autonomy, whereas freedom as potentiality is not necessarily protected by a system, but instead requires individuals to seize opportunities. Translated into the domain of cultural policy and practice, this indicates that the post-World War 2 arm's length model of cultural policy has safeguarded artistic autonomy, but also confined it to particular spaces. Contemporary 'participatory' cultural policy, instead, pursues the freedom – and power – that might arise with the seizing of opportunities, thus aiming to expand the reach of artistic practice. One such opportunity within the public art field lies in emphasizing the qualities of participatory art with respect to local governments' interest in mobilizing citizens and increasing their active local engagement. In highlighting this opportunity, the inspirational catalogue actually follows the lead of artists who, in their very engagement with participants outside white-cube spaces, have themselves taken advantage of the opportunities and power that come with a more flexible and creative collaborative environment across social sectors, including a more diverse interest in engaging artists and in financially supporting artists. Interpreted from that perspective, the catalogue might be said to respond to a situation in which the productive correlation of different 'participatory agendas' serves to promote and advance artistic practices, thus showing how this situation is used to promote artistic practices, in particular those using participatory strategies.

In foregrounding the notion of artistic autonomy in discussions of participatory art, I emphasized differences in the way in which Claire Bishop and Grant Kester framed the importance of artistic autonomy. While Bishop was concerned with securing artists a space of experimentation that was not confined beforehand by narrow 'ethical' concerns of doing good or making people feel good, Kester was more concerned with addressing the political implications of engaging participants, emphasizing the need to not let political powers play artists against their intentions. In particular, he addressed a concern with artists' ambitions of empowerment for being directed at individual citizens rather than addressing structural inequalities and aid in mobilizing strategies to counter such systemic problems. Bishop and Kester alike, however, were equally concerned to protect artistic practice from the influence of external powers, suspected of misusing artistic work to other ends than what the artists intended.

From a critical perspective, it is certainly possible to view the inspirational catalogue as a cultural policy tool that challenges artistic autonomy by connecting public art to other policy concerns. However, I think it is equally valid to view the catalogue as a strategy not only for instrumentalizing artistic practices, but for advancing and supporting artistic practices. Although it is a different strategy for promoting the arts than what was developed in the post-World War 2 period, the inspirational catalogue in a similar manner seeks to cultivate and develop an interest in public art, taking its 'opportunity' from potentially correlated interests in commissioning public art with a participatory dimension. Obviously this promotion emphasizes the contribution of some artistic forms over others, thus underlining the fact that 'the seizing of opportunities' is not equally distributed among all artists but relates to their ability to enter into relations that will promote and advance their practices. Also, this potential expansion of artistic practices is itself indebted to post-World War 2 cultural policy and its protection of artistic autonomy, since it is

the very power of the Danish Arts Foundation that enables the inspirational catalogue to pursue the further advancement of art into society.

Whereas Maravelias distinguished between freedom as autonomy and freedom as potentiality, I think it is important to underline that in the case of the inspirational catalogue, there is a correlation between both conceptualisations of freedom – and the power this entails – in respect to artistic work. Despite its 'participatory cultural policy' dimension, the inspirational catalogue remains an expression of the continued existence of an arm's length organization and the value placed on autonomous art in Denmark. To a great extent, Danish arts policy still operates according to the bureaucratic compartmentalization of specific professional fields that promote and structurally support artistic autonomy, and the inspirational catalogue cautiously balances the value of artistic autonomy with the interest in underlining art's societal contribution. In broader terms, the inspirational catalogue uses the power of the Danish Arts Foundation as a means of pursuing the increasing influence of art in society. In other words, it is a way to balance the external demands of an increasingly useful and relevant form of public art with the internal pressure to protect and support the development of the arts.

Conclusion

In this article I have addressed the relationship between art and cultural policy within a participatory culture. I initiated the article by emphasizing the continued impact of notions of artistic autonomy in the discussions of participatory art, which is counterintuitive to the fact that participatory practices to various degrees dismantle the idea of a singular creative practice in favor of co-creative work. In particular, I described how notions of artistic autonomy entangle with notions of political autonomy and the artistic aspirations of politically impacting society, leading to disputes about the relative autonomy of artists in respect to working inside white-cube settings or in durational practices infiltrating communities and networks of organizations. Next, by introducing organization studies' reflections about freedom in work, I moved on to situate art theory's continued concern with artistic autonomy as an effect of the way in which the art field has been 'bureaucratically' organized in post-World War 2 Western societies. Here I argued that art has been supported and encouraged to develop a self-understanding in respect to artists' freedom of expression and political independence to the extent that this condition is taken for granted as the normal condition for artistic work. Broadly, then, cultural policy has enabled, supported and expanded artistic practice in particular ways, which are subsequently challenged when the conditions for artistic work are revised.

I have argued that the 20th century secured the specialization of different areas, even the bureaucratic compartmentalization of specific professional fields, thus promoting autonomous artistic expressions, while the 21st century and its 'participatory culture' encourage professional fields to interact and thus demand that new forms of collaborative thinking and practicing be cultivated. Participatory art and its expansion of artistic practices offer one such field of new interactions and collaborations. Another effect of these changes is that art's relationship to heteronomous dependencies is exposed and complicated, generating new dilemmas and conflicts as a result. The purpose of this article has not been to dismiss of the value of autonomous creative work or, for that matter, the value of expanded artistic practices like socially engaged art. Rather, the purpose has been to analyze some aspects of the contemporary conditions for artistic practice in a manner that serves not only to distance art from society's powerful institutions, but to promote art's further critical engagement in society by emphasizing the need to recognize and work with – without excluding critical approaches – the institutions and expanded networks underpinning artistic work.

The article has highlighted how notions of artistic autonomy play an important part in the theorization of participatory art, linking this sustained, albeit differently conceptualized, preoccupation with autonomy to the history of art's heteronomous dependencies on a cultural policy supporting artistic autonomy. Using the perspective of organization studies, the article has framed the importance of public art support systems for the development of an artistic self-understanding around notions of freedom as autonomy that continues to thrive today. In interlinking various theoretical perspectives, the article has sought to underline the relationship between cultural policy and artistic practice, suggesting that this very relationship not only conditions, but also enables and empowers artistic practice. In fact, the article has been motivated by the desire to stress the potentially nurturing relationship between art and cultural policy rather than the possible exploitation of one by the other.

In particular, the inspirational catalogue has featured as a paradigmatic example and a case in point for how contemporary

Danish cultural policy endeavors to support and expand artistic practice, while also potentially challenging and modifying artistic practices by encouraging participatory work. The catalogue is an example of new cultural policy initiatives, but also a document that exposes art's dependencies on structural forms of support and its self-understanding as autonomous.

Participatory art is carried by the trajectory of art history to which it responds and to which it has suggested new paths forward, but also by the social changes and policy opportunities that emerged towards the end of the 20th century. Contemporary forms of participatory art are addressing societal problems while also profiting from a mixture of supportive structures that recognize their value with respect to citizen involvement. The article has challenged the art community's generalized suspicion of instrumentalization and co-optation of artistic practices by suggesting that Danish arts policy is, in fact, renegotiating the role of art in contemporary society by utilizing contemporary opportunities for seizing artistic freedom as potentiality. As such, the contemporary participatory culture conditions as well as promotes artistic practice, thus generating new artistic possibilities, although only to the extent that artists and art's institutions engage in collaboration with other organizations, including those effecting cultural policy.

Endnotes

- 1 See https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/_kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Billedkunst/Kunst_i_det_offentlige_rum/1_-_Kunsten_af_skabe_forankring_.pdf (last accessed May 20, 2019)
- 2 See Act of the Danish Arts Foundation: <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=146622> (accessed October 8, 2018).
- 3 See <https://www.kunst.dk/statens-kunsthofund/om-statens-kunsthofund/> (accessed October 5, 2018) and https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/_kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Kunstraadet/Aarsberetninger/2003_Statens_Kunstraads_aarsberetning.pdf (accessed October 5, 2018).
- 4 See MS (2012) and http://denstoredanske.dk/Samfund,_jura_og_politik/Samfund_Ministerier,_styrelser,_udvalg_og_r%C3%A5d/Kunststyrelsen (accessed October 5, 2018).
- 5 See https://slks.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/0_SLKS/Dokumenter/Om_styrelsen/Aarsrapporter_og_brugerundersogelser/Aarsrapport_Slots-og_Kulturstyrelsen_2016.pdf (accessed October 5, 2018).
- 6 This new communication initiative was made public in November 2016 at a publicized event in which the Danish Arts Foundation's members met with Danish politicians (research notes Nov 9, 2016).
- 7 These types of success stories were highlighted at the meeting with Danish politicians (research notes Nov 9, 2016), and also features in the Art Foundation's news stream on social media.
- 8 See https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/_kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Billedkunst/Kunst_i_det_offentlige_rum/1_-_Kunsten_af_skabe_forankring_.pdf (last accessed May 20, 2019)

Literature

- Adorno, T. & Horkheimer, W. (1993). *Oplysningens dialektik: filosofiske fragmenter*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- Andersen, G. (ed.) (2004). *Reinventing the Museum: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives on the Paradigm Shift*. Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Banks, M. (2010). 'Autonomy guaranteed? Cultural work and the "art-commerce relation"'. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 14, 251-269.
- Barker, J. (1993). 'Tightening the Iron Cage: Concertive Control in Self-Managing Teams'. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 38 (3): 408-437.
- Beech, D. (2011). 'The Ideology of Duration in the Dematerialised Monument'. In O'Neill, P. & Doherty, C. (eds.), *Locating the Producers: Durational Approaches to Public Art*. Amsterdam: Valiz.
- Beirne, M., M. Jennings & S. Knight (2017), 'Autonomy and resilience in cultural work: looking beyond the 'creative industries'. *Journal for Cultural Research*, 21:2, 204-221.
- Bishop, C. (2004). 'Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics'. *October*, 110: 51-79.
- Bishop, C. (2006). 'The Social Turn: Collaboration and its Discontents'. *Art Forum*, Feb.
- Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso.
- Boltanski, L. & Chiapello, E. (2007). *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London & New York: Verso.
- Bourdieu, P. (2017). 'The historical genesis of a pure aesthetic'. In Bourdieu, P., *The field of Cultural Production*. Polity.
- Bourriaud, N. (1996). *Traffic*. Bordeaux: capc musée d'art contemporain.
- Bourriaud, N. (2002). *Relational Aesthetics*. Les presses du reel.
- Budtz-Jørgensen, J., Johnsen, C. G., & Sørensen, B. M. (2019). 'Against boundarylessness: The liminal career of the flexible employee'. *Organization*.
- Byrne, J. (2012). 'Use Value and the Contemporary Work of Art: Freeing Art from the Present Technocratic Framework'. *Open: Platform for Art, Culture and the Public Domain*, May 1.
- Casey, C. (1999). "'Come join our family": Discipline and Integration in Corporate Organizational Culture'. *Human Relations*, 51 (2): 155-178.
- De Bloois, J. (2012). 'Without Exception: Art, Consensus and the Public Sphere'. *Open: Platform for Art, Culture and the Public Domain*, May 1.
- Duelund, P. (2003). 'Cultural Policy in Denmark'. In Duelund, P. (ed.), *The Nordic Cultural Model*. Copenhagen: Nordisk Kulturinstitut.
- Du Gay, P. (1994). 'Making up Managers': bureaucracy, enterprise and the liberal art of separation'. *British Journal of Sociology*, 45 (4): 655-674.
- Flemming, P. & Spicer A. (2004). 'You can check out anytime but you can never leave, spatial boundaries in a high commitment organization'. *Human Relations*, 57 (1): 75-94.
- Finkelpearl, T. (2013). *What We Made: Conversations on Art and Social Cooperations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Finkelpearl, T. (2014). 'Participatory art'. In Kelly, M. (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Frederking, L. C. (2009). 'Government entrepreneurship and the arts: the politics of the National Endowment for the Arts'. In Hjorth, D. & Steyaert, C. (eds.), *The Politics and Aesthetics of Entrepreneurship*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Gablik, S. (1995), 'Connective Aesthetics'. In Lacy, S. (ed.), *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Bay Press.
- Kester, G. (1995). 'Aesthetic Evangelists: Conversation and Empowerment in Contemporary Community Art'. *Afterimage*, 22: 5-11.
- Kester, G. (2004). *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Kester, G. (2006). 'Another Turn: A Response to Claire Bishop'. *Art Forum*, 44 (9), 22-3.
- Kester, G. (2011). *The One and the Many: Contemporary Collaborative Art in a Global Context*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

- Knell, S. J. et al (2007). *Museum Revolutions: How museums change and are changed*. Routledge.
- Knights, D. & D. McCabe (1998), 'What Happens when the Phone Goes Wild?: Staff, Stress and Spaces for Escape in a BPR Telephone Banning Work Regime', *Journal of Management Studies*, 35 (2): 163-194.
- Jackson, S. (2011). *Social Work: Performing Art, Supporting Publics*. Routledge.
- Jalving, C. (ed.) (2017). *The Art of Taking Part: Participation at the Museum*. Arken Bulletin, vol. 7.
- Jørgensen, I. L. (2016). *Institutions and Legitimations in Finance for the Arts*. PhD School in Organisation and Management Studies, PhD Series 25.
- Lacy, S. (ed.), (1995). *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Bay Press.
- Laermans, R. (2010). 'Artistic Autonomy as Value and Practice'. In Gielen, P. & de Bruyne, P. (eds.), *Being an Artist in Post-Fordist Times*. Rotterdam: nai010 publishers.
- Loacker, B. (2013). 'Becoming "culturpreneur": How the 'neoliberal regime of truth' affects and redefines artistic subject positions'. *Culture and Organization*, 19(2), 124–145.
- Maravelias, C. (2007). 'Freedom at work in the age of post-bureaucratic organization'. *Ephemera*, 7(4).
- MS (2012). 'Kunststyrelsen bliver til kulturstyrelsen'. *Kunsten.nu*, January 9. Available at <https://kunsten.nu/journal/kunststyrelsen-bliver-til-kulturstyrelsen/> (accessed October 5, 2018)
- Møller, S. F. (2012). *From Disinterestedness to Engagement: Towards Relational Leadership In the Cultural Sector*. Frederiksberg: Copenhagen Business School, PhD Series, No. 39.
- Neergaard, U. (2015), 'Introduktion: Om forankring gennem deltagelse'. In Nielsen, T. F. (ed.): 'Kunsten at skabe forankring: deltagelse og formidling af kunst i offentlige rum'. Copenhagen: The Agency for Culture. See https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Billedkunst/Kunst_i_det_offentlige_rum/1_-_Kunsten_af_skabe_forankring.pdf (last accessed May 20, 2019)
- O'Neill, P. & Doherty, C. (2011). 'Introduction'. In O'Neill, P. & Doherty, C. (eds.), *Locating the Producers: Durational Approaches to Public Art*. Amsterdam: Valiz.
- Osborne, P. (2012). 'Theorem 4: Autonomy: can it be true of art and politics at the same time?'. *Open: Platform for Art, Culture and the Public Domain*, May 1.
- Petersen, T. M (2015). 'Penge til runesten tages fra kunstfond'. *Berlingske*, November 19.
- Reckwitz, A. (2017), *The Invention of Creativity: Modern society and the culture of the new*. Polity.
- Seijdel, J. (2012). 'Autonomy: New Forms of Freedom and Independence in Art and Culture'. *Open: Platform for Art, Culture and the Public Domain*, May 1.
- Sestoft, C. (1999). Noter om kunstens autonomi. In Michelsen, A. et al. (eds.), *Kunstteori: Positioner i nutidig kunstdebat*. Copenhagen: Borgen.
- Sholette, G. (2017). *Delirium and Resistance: Activist Art and the Crisis of Capitalism*. London: Pluto Press.
- Sørensen, A. S. (2014). "Deltagelseskulturens former". *Aktuel forskning*. Institut for kulturvidenskaber, Odense: Syddansk Universitet, September.
- Sørensen, A. S. (2015). "'Deltagelse' som kulturpolitisk strategi og institutionel kulturformidling". *Aktuel forskning*. Institut for kulturvidenskaber. Odense: Syddansk Universitet, december.
- Tanner, J. (2003). 'Introduction: Sociology and Art History'. In Tanner, J. (eds.), *The Sociology of Art: a Reader*. Routledge.
- Thompson, N. (2015). *Seeing Power: Art and Activism in the 21st Century*. Brooklyn, NY: Melville House.
- Willmot, H. (1993). 'Ignorance is strength; slavery is freedom, managing culture in modern organizations'. *Journal of Management Studies*, 30(4): 512–52.
- Wyszomirski, M. J. (1995). 'From Accord to Discord: Arts Policy During and After the Culture Wars'. In Mulcahy, K. & Wyszomirski, M. J. (eds.), *America's Commitment to Culture: Government and the Arts*. Boulder, San Francisco & Oxford: Westview Press.
- Ørskov, G. (2016). "Dansk kunst amputeres af nedskæringer". *Politiken*, April 21.

Websites

[https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/_kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Billedkunst/Kunst i det offentlige rum/1 - Kunsten af skabe forankring .pdf](https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/_kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Billedkunst/Kunst_i_det_offentlige_rum/1_-_Kunsten_af_skabe_forankring_.pdf) (last accessed May 20, 2019)

Act of the Danish Arts Foundation: <https://www.retsinformation.dk/Forms/R0710.aspx?id=146622> (accessed October 8, 2018).

<https://www.kunst.dk/statens-kunsthof/om-statens-kunsthof/> (accessed October 5, 2018)

[https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/_kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Kunstraadet/Aarsberetninger/2003 Statens Kunstraads aarsberetning.pdf](https://www.kunst.dk/fileadmin/_kunst2011/user_upload/Dokumenter/Kunstraadet/Aarsberetninger/2003_Statens_Kunstraads_aarsberetning.pdf) (accessed October 5, 2018).

[http://denstoredanske.dk/Samfund, jura og politik/Samfund/Ministerier, styrelser, udvalg og r%C3%A5d/Kunststyrelsen](http://denstoredanske.dk/Samfund,_jura_og_politik/Samfund/Ministerier,_styrelser,_udvalg_og_r%C3%A5d/Kunststyrelsen) (accessed October 5, 2018).

[https://slks.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/0 SLKS/Dokumenter/Om styrelsen/Aarsrapporter og brugerundersogelser/Aarsrapport Slots- og Kulturstyrelsen 2016.pdf](https://slks.dk/fileadmin/user_upload/0_SLKS/Dokumenter/Om_styrelsen/Aarsrapporter_og_brugerundersogelser/Aarsrapport_Slots-og_Kulturstyrelsen_2016.pdf) (accessed October 5, 2018).